

Section III:

**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121 to the
DRAWINGS**

No amendments or changes to the Drawings are proposed.

Section IV:**AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121****REMARKS****Reconsideration after Previous Reply**

We appreciate the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and 35 U.S.C. §112.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The present rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are made over newly-cited references to Chen, Geoghegan, and Pugliese. We are submitting this amendment with a Request for Continued Examination in order to further the prosecution in view of these new references. We believe the previous rejections over Mankes in view of Schiff were intended to be withdrawn, but the first paragraph on Page 5 of the Office Action appears to be inadvertently included in the new rationale for rejections over Chen, Geoghegan and Pugliese. The following reply assumes this is a typographical error, but if it is not, we would appreciate clarification and an opportunity to file a supplemental reply. Applicant's agent Robert Frantz can be reached at 405-812-5613 if needed.

Claim 1. Our invention interfaces directly to a hotel's Property Management System (PMS), which is a specific term in the industry referring to the on-site (e.g. at the hotel) computing system which not only records room reservations into an inventory database, but also tracks available rooms in inventory, provides front desk operations such as bill printing and bill consolidation, etc. When you check into a hotel, the terminal which the front desk agent is using is connected directly to the hotel's PMS.

There are many PMS systems available, from low cost, single-hotel versions for use by independently owned hotels, to more elaborate systems for larger hotels and resorts. We are submitting via a supplemental Information Disclosure Statement a list of some 100+ PMS systems available on the market today as evidence of the wide variety of these proprietary systems available today to hoteliers.

Central Reservation Systems (CRS) are systems for hoteliers who own or operate multiple hotels. They provide inventory tracking and reservation making/changing/cancelling, but often do not provide other front desk functions of the on-site PMS systems. So, many CRS systems interface to multiple on-site PMS systems to produce a comprehensive solution.

Finally, a Global Distribution System (GDS) integrates central reservation systems from multiple CRS systems, such as from multiple hotel chains (e.g. Hyatt, Marriot and Accor), as well as from other types of services (e.g. airlines, rental cars, etc.).

We believe that these terms are used consistently between our disclosure, claims, and the cited references.

Our invention, however, aims to circumvent the use of a GDS or CRS to allow a user to *directly* access a hotel's PMS (para. 0044), normally something that is only allowed for hotel employees. Traditionally, the most direct manner of making a reservation by a non-hotel employee directly into the hotel's PMS is either (a) make the reservation at the front desk by talking with a hotel employee, (b) make the reservation by phone directly with an employee at the hotel, or (c) fax a reservation request directly to the hotel where an employee enters and confirms it. These direct reservations tend to be the most certain reservations because the offered amenities such as room type, room location and view, etc., are being quoted directly from the actual inventory database of the hotel itself, not from a replicated database of a GDS or CRS which may not be accurate (e.g. it is pending a synchronization with the hotel's PMS).

Another reason to make a reservation directly with the hotel into their PMS is cost or commissions – cutting the GDS and CRS out of the loop eliminates certain commissions and fees charged by those parties. So, travel agents who book directly with a hotel receive larger commissions, and guests who book directly with hotels often receive discounted rates.

So, our invention does not interface to or through a CRS or GDS, as the cited references do. Instead, our "primary site" is a clone of a hotel's PMS terminal (para. 0027), not a clone of a CRS or GDS system. Moreover, our interface to the hotel's PMS is through terminal emulation (para. 0050). Even though the user is accessing our system through a customized user interface instead of a hotel employee interface, the PMS system knows nothing different than an employee is booking a reservation directly from a PMS terminal at the hotel. For small hotels which own a PMS, this provides (a) customized interfaces for various user types (travel agent, wholesaler,

guest) into their otherwise-user-unfriendly PMS, (b) helps eliminate costs, fees and commissions by eliminating use of a GDS and/or CRS, and (c) improves booking accuracy by booking reservations directly into their PMS system rather than through a periodically synchronized GDS or CRS database.

Our present amendment provides these additional details regarding our invention and its advantages. We believe these advantages are non-obvious over the complex systems of the references, because it eliminates multiple computer systems of the traditional arrangement of PMS+CRS+GDS, while achieving all, if not more, of the objectives of the arrangement of the prior art.

We especially believe that Geoghegan's disclosure is not directed towards any combination, rearrangement, or modification which would eliminate a GDS, whereas it is developed by and owned by Sabre, Inc., which is one of the largest GDS operators. It would be unlikely that their disclosure would aim to eliminate their core operations, and in fact, a GDS and CRS are both featured prominently throughout their disclosure.

For these reasons, we respectfully request allowance of our claims as amended.

Request for Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

We believe we have responded to all grounds of rejection and objection, but if the Examiner disagrees, we would appreciate the opportunity to supplement our reply.

We believe the present amendment places the claims in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, it is believed that the claims are not in a condition for allowance, we respectfully request constructive recommendations per MPEP 707.07(j) II which would place the claims in condition for allowance without need for further proceedings. We will respond promptly to any Examiner-initiated interviews or to consider any proposed examiner amendments.

Respectfully,

/ Robert Frantz /

Robert H. Frantz
U.S. Patent Agent, Reg. № 42,553
Tel: (405) 812-5613
Franklin Gray Patents, LLC